## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

BILL M., by and through his father and	)	
natural guardian, William M.; JOHN DOE, by	)	
and through his mother and natural guardian,	)	Case No. 4:03CV3189
Jane Doe; HEATHER V., by and through her	)	
mother and guardian, Marcia V.; JANE S.;	)	
KEVIN V., by and through his legal guardian	)	
Kathy V.; JENNIFER T., by and through her	)	
legal guardians, Sharon and Greg T.; LESLIE	)	
H.; CATHERINE M.; STEPHANIE B.;	)	
CONRAD J., by and through his legal	)	
guardian, C.W. J.; CHRISTOPHER H., by	)	
and through his legal guardian, Sue H.;	)	
MICHAEL R., by and through his legal	)	
guardian, Susan R.; and on behalf of	)	
themselves and all other persons similarly	)	
situated,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	MEMORANDUM
	)	AND ORDER
VS.	)	
	)	
NEBRASKA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH	)	
AND HUMAN SERVICES FINANCE AND	)	
SUPPORT, NEBRASKA DEPARTMENT	)	
OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,	)	
RICHARD NELSON, in his official capacity	)	
as the Director of Nebraska Department of	)	
Health & Human Services Finance and	)	
Support; and NANCY MONTANEZ, in her	)	
official capacity as the Director of Nebraska	)	
Department of Health & Human Services,	)	
D C 1	)	
Defendants.	)	

Before I "approved" the settlement agreement in this case, the parties were informed in a memorandum and order that:

1. I made no determination that the settlement agreement was good or bad or fair or unfair.

2. With the exception that I would resolve the attorney fee question, I retained no jurisdiction to enforce or construe the settlement agreement in the future. In other words, the settlement agreement was merely a contract between the parties and my "approval" of it conferred no other status.

## (Filing 172 (April 9, 2008 Mem & and Order).)

To be doubly sure, I required the parties to certify that they had read the aforementioned memorandum and order and, after having done so, requested that I grant the joint motion and stipulation for approval of settlement. (*Id.*) Both parties filed the required certifications. (Filings 174 (Defs.' Resp.) & 175 (Pls.' Resp.) Thereafter, I "approved" the settlement agreement, subject to the terms of my previous memorandum and order. (Filing 177 (April 21, 2008 Mem. & Order).) Judgement was entered dismissing this case with prejudice with the court retaining jurisdiction only to decide the attorney fee question. (Filing 179.)

In a similar case, the Eighth Circuit has ruled that a private settlement agreement is not enough to allow attorney fees under 42 U.S.C. § 1988(b). *Christina A. v. Bloomberg*, 315 F.3d 990, 993 (8th Cir. 2003) (settlement agreement failed to make juvenile inmate class a "prevailing party" and thus no attorney fees were awarded). *See also Rexam Inc. v. United Steel Workers of America*, *AFL-CIO-CLC*, No. 03-CV-2998, 2008 WL 583702 (D. Minn. Feb. 6, 2008) (following *Christina A*).

The plaintiffs acknowledge the existence of *Christina A* but criticize the opinion, suggesting that I should not follow it. (Filing 182 (Pls.' Br.) at CM/ECF p. 7.) As a district judge within the Eighth Circuit, I am not free to disregard precedent from the Eighth Circuit. I must follow *Christina A* because it is a closely analogous case and is properly considered precedential.  $^{1}$ 

Here, there is no question that the agreement I "approved" is nothing more than a private settlement agreement. I made that plain to the parties before I approved their agreement. Knowing my views, they asked me to approve their disposition of this case understanding that I expressed no opinion on the merits of the agreement and that I retained no jurisdiction to enforce or construe their contract. Simply put, the plaintiffs are not "prevailing parties" within the meaning of any of the applicable statutes or cases. Therefore, I should not award them attorney fees.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Although the Court of Appeals does not need my approval, in my view, *Christina A* was properly decided.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion for attorney fees (filing 180) is denied. A separate judgment will be issued.

June 20, 2008.

BY THE COURT:

s/Richard G. Kopf
United States District Judge